



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/758,953 | 01/16/2004 | Albert C. Brown | SVL920065008US3 | 6170 |

47069 7590 11/07/2008
KONRAD RAYNES & VICTOR, LLP
ATTN: IBM54
315 SOUTH BEVERLY DRIVE, SUITE 210
BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

WHIPPLE, BRIAN P

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2452

| | |
|-------------------|---------------|
| NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|-------------------|---------------|

11/07/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

krvuspto@ipmatters.com

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/758,953 | Applicant(s) BROWN ET AL. | |
| | Examiner BRIAN P. WHIPPLE | Art Unit 2452 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 August 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 36,38-44,46-50 and 52-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 36,38-44,46-50 and 52-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 36, 38-44, 46-50, and 52-56 are pending in this application and presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments have been considered, but are directed to amended subject matter. Therefore, they are properly addressed in the prior art rejections below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 36, 38-50, and 52-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Challenger et al. (Challenger), submitted by the applicant (item 20 in the Information Disclosure Statement filed on 8/18/04), in view of what was well known in the art, further in view of Haverstock et al. (Haverstock), U.S. Publication No. 2002/0038357 A1, and further in view of Yuen et al. (Yuen), U.S. Publication No. 2003/0033037 A1.

5. As to claim 36, Challenger discloses a method for managing electronic content on a computer network, the method comprising:

under control of an electronic content management system, wherein the electronic content management system provides content searching and revision history management, wherein the electronic content management system includes an electronic library, wherein the electronic content management system is linked to a web content manager to integrate the functions of the enterprise content management system with functions of the web content manager (Pg. 847, § B.1, ¶ 5, ln. 8-13; Pg. 847, § B.2, ln. 1-4; Pg. 848, § B.2, ln. 8-10; Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 3, ln. 1-4; Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 8, ln. 3-7; Pg. 848, Fig. 6; Pg. 849, Fig. 7);

storing a plurality of files in the electronic content library (Pg. 847, § B.2, ln. 1-4; Pg. 848, § B.2, ln. 8-10; Pg. 848, Fig. 6);

maintaining revision history data for at least one of the files stored in the electronic content library (Pg. 847, § B.1, ¶ 5, ln. 8-13; Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 3, ln. 1-4; Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 8, ln. 3-7; Pg. 848, Fig. 6; Pg. 849, Fig. 7);

checking-out a selected file from the electronic content library upon a user's request, wherein the selected file is revised by the user (Pg. 847, § B.1, ¶ 4, ln. 7-10; Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 5, ln. 13-14 and 20-21; Pg. 849, Fig. 7);

checking-in an updated version of the selected file to the electronic content library
(Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 3, ln. 1-4; Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 8, ln. 3-7; Pg. 849, Fig. 7);

updating the revision history data in the electronic content library in response to the
updated version of the selected file being checked-in (Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 3, ln. 1-4; Pg. 848, §
B.2, ¶ 8, ln. 3-7; Pg. 849, Fig. 7);

launching a content approval workflow process to determine whether the updated
version is approved (Pg. 844, ¶ 7, ln. 1-8; Pg. 847, § B.1, ¶ 4, ln. 7-10; Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 5, ln.
13-14; Pg. 849, Fig. 7, “Quality Assurance”);

in response to determining that the updated version has been approved (Pg. 844, ¶ 7,
ln. 1-8; Pg. 847, § B.1, ¶ 4, ln. 7-10; Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 5, ln. 13-14; Pg. 849, Fig. 7, “Quality
Assurance”), launching a workflow process to notify the web content manager of the
updated version of the selected file based on modification to the selected file (Pg. 848, § B.2,
¶ 3, ln. 1-4; Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 8, ln. 3-7; Pg. 849, Fig. 7; Specifically, the Trigger Monitor
tracks modification, deletion, and addition; and publishes data to Web Server.); and

wherein, in response to the notification, the web content manager publishes the
updated version of the selected file using the updated version stored in the electronic content
library of the enterprise content management system and using web content relationship
information stored by the web content manager, wherein the web content manager includes
a web relationship library in which the web relationship information is stored (Pg. 845, §

A.2, ¶ 1, ln. 1-6; Pg. 845, Fig. 2; Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 3, ln. 1-4; Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 8, ln. 3-7; Pg. 849, Fig. 7; Specifically, the Trigger Monitor tracks modification, deletion, and addition; and publishes data to Web Server).

Challenger's teachings include tracking pending fragments awaiting publishing as part of a webpage and certain fragments require that a proofreader approve fragments prior to publication (Pg. 844, ¶ 7, ln. 1-5; Pg. 847, § B.1, ¶ 4, ln. 7-10). It may be argued that tracking pending fragments to an existing webpage is revision history data. However, Challenger does not appear to explicitly teach this in the embodiment of keeping a history of previous versions of a webpage following updating of the webpage.

However, Official Notice is taken that this is a well-known part of the networking, and specifically web development, field. For example, the Wayback Machine (<http://www.archive.org/web/web.php>) is a service that can be used to display a history of old versions of webpages and to view the webpages. Additionally, logging changes to a webpage is standard practice for many web administrators. This is seen at sites such as Wikipedia.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Challenger by using the well known practice of maintaining revision history data for purposes such as allowing a user to display old versions

of a webpage to see changes and to allow a user or administrator to roll back undesired changes to a webpage.

Challenger and what was well known in the art are silent on the enterprise content management system includes a workflow processor that provides workflow management of workflow processes.

However, Haverstock discloses the enterprise content management system includes a workflow processor that provides workflow management of workflow processes (Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Challenger and what was well known in the art by having the enterprise content management system include a workflow processor that provides workflow management of workflow processes as taught by Haverstock in order to enable the automated distribution, routing, and tracking of web documents (Haverstock: Abstract; [0005]).

Challenger, what was well known in the art, and Haverstock are silent on the selected file is checked-out in response to a determining that a user requesting the checking-out of the selected file is authorized to check-out the selected file based on user authorization content relating user classes with actions that can be performed on the electronic content in the electronic content library, wherein certain functions for modifying the selected file are capable of being disabled based on permissions stored in the user authorization content, and

wherein functions that are unique to the electronic data for the web content manager are capable of being enabled.

However, Yuen discloses the selected file is checked-out in response to a determining that a user requesting the checking-out of the selected file is authorized to check-out the selected file based on user authorization content relating user classes with actions that can be performed on the electronic content in the electronic content library, wherein certain functions for modifying the selected file are capable of being disabled based on permissions stored in the user authorization content, and wherein functions that are unique to the electronic data for the web content manager are capable of being enabled (Fig. 7; [0045]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Challenger, what was well known in the art, and Haverstock by including access control data as taught by Yuen in order to ensure that undesirable users are not granted access to files that should be reserved for trusted users.

6. As to claim 38, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 36 above (Challenger: Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 3, ln. 1-4; Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 8, ln. 3-7; Pg. 849, Fig. 7; Specifically, the Trigger Monitor tracks modification, deletion, and addition; and publishes data to Web Server).

7. As to claim 39, Challenger, what was well known in the art, Haverstock, and Yuen disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 36, including notifying a user authorized to approve changes that the updated version of the selected file has been checked-in to the electronic content library (Challenger: Pg. 844, ¶ 7, ln. 1-5; Pg. 847, § B.1, ¶ 4, ln. 7-10; Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 5, ln. 13-14 and 20-21; Pg. 849, Fig. 7).

8. As to claim 40, the claim is rejected for reasons similar to claim 36 above. It may be interpreted that Challenger, what was well known in the art, Haverstock, and Yuen disclose non-web-based data. Proofreaders may reject content proposed for publication to the web (Challenger: Pg. 844, ¶ 7, ln. 1-5).

9. As to claim 41, Challenger, what was well known in the art, Haverstock, and Yuen disclose the invention substantially as in the parent claim, including the web-based electronic content comprises computer files containing multimedia data (Challenger: Pg. 850, Fig. 8).

10. As to claim 42, Challenger, Haverstock, and Yuen do not explicitly disclose metadata, but Official Notice (See MPEP 2144.03) is taken that metadata is well known in the

networking, and specifically the web development, field as a means of expressing, for example, data about data contained in a webpage, such as topic of interest.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Challenger, Haverstock, and Yuen by explicitly disclosing the content comprising files containing metadata as is well known in the art for the purpose of expressing data about data contained in a webpage.

11. As to claim 43, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 41 above.

12. As to claim 44, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 36 above (See the discussion of the inherency versus obviousness, in view of what was well known in the art, for revision history data).

13. As to claims 46-47 and 50, the claims are rejected for reasons similar to claim 36 above (Challenger: Pg. 846, left column, ln. 25-42; Pg. 846, Fig. 3; Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 3, ln. 1-4; Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 8, ln. 3-7; Pg. 849, Fig. 7; Specifically, the Trigger Monitor tracks modification, deletion, and addition; and publishes data to Web Server).

14. As to claim 48, the claim is rejected for reasons similar to claim 39 above.

15. As to claim 49, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 36 above.

16. As to claim 52, Challenger, what was well known in the art, Haverstock, and Yuen disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 49. Challenger appears to be silent on the webpages being Internet webpages. However, Official Notice is taken that Internet webpages were extremely well known in the art. In fact, they are the standard method for presenting webpages to other users.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Challenger, Haverstock, and Yuen by publishing webpages to the Internet as was extremely well known in the art, as frequently it is desired to have users across numerous different networks access a published webpage, for purposes such as dissemination of information and/or advertising.

17. As to claim 53, Challenger, what was well known in the art, Haverstock, and Yuen disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 15. Challenger appears to be silent on the webpages being intranet webpages. However, Official Notice is taken that intranet webpages were extremely well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Challenger, Haverstock, and Yuen by publishing webpages to an intranet as was extremely well known in the art, for the purpose of limiting webpages to an internal network if information is sensitive, private, or irrelevant to external users.

18. As to claim 54, Challenger, what was well known in the art, Haverstock, and Yuen disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 49, including publishing the changed electronic content on a website; and checking the integrity of the website (Challenger: Pg. 844, ¶ 7, ln. 5-8).

19. As to claims 55-56, the claims are rejected for reasons similar to claim 48 above.

Conclusion

20. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See the Notice of References Cited (PTO-892).

21. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRIAN P. WHIPPLE whose telephone number is (571)270-1244. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (10:30 AM to 7:00 PM EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Brian P. Whipple
/B. P. W./
Examiner, Art Unit 2452
10/31/08

/Kenny S Lin/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2452